



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CURRENT NOTES

THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

The Sixteenth Annual Meeting of the American Society of International Law was held, according to the program sent to the members and printed in the last number of the Journal, pages 274-275, at Washington, April 27-29, 1922.

The Honorable Elihu Root, President of the Society, opened the meeting on the evening of April 27 with a carefully prepared address on the subject of "International Law at the Arms Conference", in which he reviewed the general nature of the Conference work as a whole. Speaking of the Four-Power Treaty, concluded between Great Britain, France, Japan and the United States, he said:

I doubt if any formal treaty ever accomplished so much by doing so little. It provided that we should all respect rights, which we were bound to do already, and that if controversy arose about the Pacific islands (it was quite immaterial what islands), the parties should get together and talk it over, which was the very thing they were then doing in Washington. The consent of the Senate was not necessary to such an agreement. It merely arranged for following an ordinary form of diplomatic intercourse. The President had done the same thing at Algeciras and at The Hague and at the Conference of London without asking the consent of the Senate, and the Senate had ratified the conclusions reached at those conferences. It was important, however, that the Senate should give its approval in this case because the instrument was a formal certificate to all the people of Japan and all the people of the United States and all the civilized Powers that the parties to the treaty had abandoned their mutual distrust and had ceased to think about war with each other and had resumed relations of genuine friendship.

Mr. Root then described the work of the Conference in removing further causes of irritation incident to the contacts of Western civilization with the peculiar and widely different civilization of China and other Oriental countries. "It is difficult to determine", he said, just how far China and the other countries "have been admitted to the family of nations who are entitled to the benefits and subject to the obligations of international law", and, after pointing out that the conditions out of which China's present difficulties have arisen were created in the early years when China was unable to comply with the rules of international law and her relations with other Powers could only be governed by "the moral right to be treated fairly and decently and her obligation was a moral obligation to treat others in the same way",

Mr. Root said, "It is also clear that the continuance of the same inability to perform international obligations has down to the present time prevented the full admission of China to the circle of states governed by international law, notwithstanding her inclusion in diplomatic conferences and regular diplomatic intercourse".

He reviewed the treaty relations between China and the Western countries and the action of the Conference at Washington with relation to the subjects covered by these treaties. Referring to the Washington treaties and resolutions, Mr. Root said:

Any one examining the treaties and resolutions will find that they uniformly sought a double object, first, to relieve the limitations and inconveniences flowing from the old conventional relations as far as was then practicable under the existing governmental conditions in China, and second, to afford to all sections and parties of the Chinese people a helpful incentive to unite in the establishment of an effective and stable government by making specific provisions under which such a government, competent to perform its national duties, will be the means of bringing China into the full possession of the rights and liberties assured by international law to the members of the family of nations, just as Japan has been brought into that family.

In concluding this section of his address, Mr. Root paid the following tribute to the Chinese people:

Personally I am a believer in the coming of that event. It will be a long difficult process, for it requires the new education of more than four hundred million people, but I look to the future of that industrious, kindly, peaceable people, with their inveterate respect for individual and family rights, not as a yellow peril, but as a great reinforcement to the power of ordered liberty upon the domination of which the future of our civilization depends.

Mr. Root then gave a detailed explanation of the objects and purposes of the treaty relating to submarines, which he described as "an appeal to the public opinion of mankind to establish and maintain a fundamental rule of morals applied to international conduct in the form of a rule of international law". "We are all familiar", he said, "with the assertion that international law is not really law because it has no sanction. That is only a half truth and therefore misleading. The real sanction of international law comes from the punishing power of public opinion, a power which has been growing with great rapidity in recent years and bids fair to grow still more rapidly with the increased public participation in the conduct of foreign affairs." He continued:

I have no doubt that the provision of this treaty which serves to put such acts as the sinking of the *Lusitania* in the same class as piracy correctly registers and formally declares the deliberate opinion of the civilized world outside of Germany and of many people in Germany, and that this formal solemn declaration of the criminal quality of the

act will very greatly decrease the probability of its repetition by any nation hereafter because it will present the practical certainty of universal public condemnation which no nation can afford to incur.

Similar considerations, he said, applied to the provisions of the treaty prohibiting the use of poisonous gases.

Mr. Root summarized his remarks as follows:

It will be seen from what I have said that while the Washington Conference had no concern with the making of international law, it did naturally and effectively, as incidental to giving effect to its policy of limiting armament, take quite important steps in the direction of developing and strengthening international law.

It took one further step by resolution providing for the appointment of a commission to consider and report upon the condition and requirements of international law affecting the other new agencies of warfare which have produced so startling an effect upon military and naval conflicts.

The time has not yet come when international affairs are sufficiently settled to make immediately practicable a general conference to consider, clarify, extend and strengthen the law of nations, but it is already high time for those who believe in a world controlled by law, to begin their preparation for such a conference, and the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament, as a by-product of its own special work, has contributed materially towards that preparation.

In a carefully prepared paper, Rear Admiral Harry S. Knapp, of the United States Navy, Retired, gave a professional analysis of, and comments on, the Treaty for the Limitation of Armament. He pointed out in what respects the Conference had fulfilled its purpose and in what respects it had failed of its purpose, as indicated in the American program. It appeared from his remarks that the American Navy had eventually made a greater sacrifice of naval power than was contemplated in the generous proposal of Secretary of State Hughes made at the opening of the Conference.

In a paper entitled "Principles of International Law and Justice raised by China at the Washington Conference", Professor Westel W. Willoughby, of Johns Hopkins University, who was the legal adviser to the Chinese Republic in 1916 and 1917, raised the following questions without attempting to answer them:

First, the circumstances under which, or the principles in accordance with which, the validity of existing agreements between sovereign nations may be attacked. The query had reference, of course, to the treaties and agreements between China and Japan of 1915, growing out of the so-called twenty-one demands of the latter. As subsidiary to the main question, Professor Willoughby queried: (a) Will China be justified, whenever she is in a position to do so with the possibility of success, in declaring the abrogation of these agreements? (b) Can it be said that these treaties and agreements of 1915 were invalid by reason of the fact that, taken in connection with the circumstances under which they were signed, they were in violation of

those fundamental principles of right upon which the whole body of international law is founded?

The second main question raised by Professor Willoughby was as to the binding force of treaties which have not been ratified by one or more of the parties signatory to them in accordance with the mandatory provisions of their respective systems of constitutional law, involving also a query as to the extent to which one Power in dealing with another Power is held to know the constitutional provisions of that other Power. The speaker asserted that, "It is a notorious fact that none of the treaties and other agreements entered into during recent years with China have received that parliamentary approval which its constitution requires." In this connection Professor Willoughby also queried as to the continuing force of executive understandings, such as the Root-Takahira agreement of 1908 and the Lansing-Ishii agreement of 1917. These kind of agreements, he stated, were the only evidence of some of China's alleged international obligations.

Professor Willoughby then raised a series of questions regarding the effect of China's declaration of war against Germany upon the treaties then existing between them. He also brought up the question of the right of China to denounce unilaterally trade agreements made with other Powers, and the principle of international law with reference to the right of one state to send into or to station its troops within the territory of another state for the protection of its nationals.

The opening session was concluded with an address by Mr. Frederick Moore, Foreign Councillor to the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who briefly discussed some of the questions raised by the preceding speakers, and then entered upon not, as he stated, a justification of all that Japan had done in the Far East "because they are human and they have their difficulties, and their temptations also", but a statement in mitigation of the charges which have been made against them, many of which, he said, are unfair. The speaker discussed various matters and incidents relating to the relations of Japan and China which, together with official statements regarding Japan's foreign policy, he thought "ought to make clear the two vital interests of Japan in international affairs,—first, the necessity of seeing that no other great Power shall lodge itself in China that will become a menace to Japan; secondly, the necessity for Japan to obtain raw materials and agricultural supplies from the neighboring mainland and of marketing her manufactured goods there."

Mr. Moore quoted the following extract from the statement by Admiral Baron Kato, ranking Japanese delegate to the Washington Conference, in a public speech in New York on January 14, 1922:

An effort has been made for a number of years to present Japan to you as a military nation designing to dominate the Pacific. Some of us Japanese have tried to disabuse the minds of those who were wont to believe this calumny, but with many the charge remained unrefuted up

to the present Conference. Within these recent weeks, Japan, by accepting the 5-5-3 ratio, has given evidence which only the weak-minded will in future dispute; and at the same time this ratio is also assurance that you have no intention of assaulting us. We have never aspired or intended to challenge the security of America or her far-ranging possessions; we have sought only security for ourselves.

In conclusion Mr. Moore said:

The Conference of Washington, as Senator Underwood said, has given to China a *magna charta*. The nations have renewed their pledges to respect her sovereignty, and it will be very difficult for any of them to go seriously behind their agreements, even if any should want to do so. That coöperation of the Powers in China, as provided by the Conference treaties, will greatly benefit China, and next to China, Japan; and for that reason those Japanese leaders who understand, welcome the work of the Washington Conference. Understanding and coöperating mean peace among the Powers in the Far East, and must aid the prosperity of both China and Japan.

It is now for the Chinese to unify their country, create a condition of security for life and property within it, and establish their responsibility to others. When they have done that, as the Japanese did with conspicuously fewer resources and advantages, they will find equal facility in getting rid of the humiliation of extraterritoriality and the presence of foreign troops at their capital and elsewhere.

The Committee for the Advancement of International Law met on Friday morning at 10 o'clock under the chairmanship of Mr. Root, who urged upon the Committee the necessity of private initiative in restating the rules of international law affected by the war, formulating amendments thereto, reconciling divergent views, and considering the subjects not now adequately regulated by international law, for the eventual use of official international conferences when the governments are ready to act upon these subjects. He thought that unquestionably the time has come when such preparation ought to be going on.

Suppose (he said) that five years hence the world is in a sufficiently chastened and sober mood to sit down and think about such a thing as law, if they got together without material they would not be able to do anything. The Hague Conferences would not have been able to do anything if the work had not been done beforehand. They had well-matured and thought out plans to consider and say yes or no to them, and to make suggestions and criticisms about them. That process ought to be going on now. If everybody waits, they will wait until too late. Somebody ought to begin, get the thing going, get people to think about it, get people to make and formulate propositions. That is the only way to avoid a very disastrous result, when the political bodies ruling the states are ready to act.

The Committee then divided into four subcommittees dealing respectively with

(1) To restate the established rules of international law, especially, and in the first instance, in the fields affected by the events of the recent war.

(2) To formulate and agree upon the amendments and additions, if any, to the rules of international law shown to be necessary or useful by the events of the war and the changes in the conditions of international life and intercourse which have followed the war.

(3) To endeavor to reconcile divergent views and secure general agreement upon the rules which have been in dispute heretofore.

(4) To consider the subjects not now adequately regulated by international law, but as to which the interests of international justice require that rule of law shall be declared and accepted.

The subcommittees conferred and discussed during the remainder of Friday morning and afternoon and submitted their reports Friday evening, April 28.

The evening session of April 28 was opened with an interesting paper by Baron S. A. Korff, Professor of Political Science in the School of Foreign Service of Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., on the subject of "The Equality of States". He strongly defended the principle of equality against the opposing principle of the domination of the great Powers, and reinforced his argument by comparing the number and influence of the so-called great Powers at the time of the Second Hague Conference, with the number and influence of the same Powers at the present time as the result of the World War.

Upon the conclusion of Baron Korff's interesting paper, Dr. David Jayne Hill presented an exhaustive and valuable report of Subcommittee No. 1 on the subject of "Visit, Search and Capture", in which it was stated that the subcommittee "having regard only to what is essentially uniform and constant in the instructions and prize codes of maritime nations, and reserving variations for subsequent discussion, . . . considers that the 'common law' regarding visit, search and capture, as accepted in substance by all maritime nations, may be codified in the following propositions:"

I. Belligerent war vessels have the right to ascertain the nationality and character of all vessels met on the high seas or in belligerent waters.

II. The war vessels of neutral Powers met by belligerent war vessels are exempt from visit and search, but it is the duty of a neutral promptly to signify his nationality.

III. Enemy vessels, except cartel and hospital ships, and a few others, are liable to capture outside of neutral jurisdiction.

IV. Neutral vessels under enemy convoy are liable to capture; neutral vessels under neutral convoy are exempt from search under the guarantee of the convoy commander.

V. Neutral private vessels met on the high seas are liable to visit; and, if their innocence is doubtful, to further examination and search.

VI. Neutral private vessels are liable to capture (a) if they attempt to avoid examination by flight or resistance; (b) if they carry contraband of war, except under special treaty exemptions; (c) if they attempt

to evade an effective blockade; (d) if they are guilty of unneutral service; (e) if they are under fraudulent convoy.

VII. Vessels liable to visit and search are entitled to summons to stop and lie to by a public belligerent vessel displaying its national flag, the summons being given by firing a blank charge or by other intelligible signal.

VIII. Visit consists of the appearance on board the merchant ship of one or more officers of the warship, bearing side arms, and accompanied by a few unarmed men who usually remain in the small boat while the officers examine the ship's papers. If these papers, showing the nationality, ownership, destination, and cargo of the ship, furnish satisfactory evidence of innocence, the vessel is to be released; if there is reasonable doubt, the ship may be searched; and, if evidence of guilt under Proposition VI, as above, is found, the vessel may be seized.

IX. The act of capture is signified by hoisting the flag of the captor on the vessel seized.

X. The captured vessel should then, if possible, be sent in under command or control of the captor for adjudication in a prize court of the captor's country.

XI. If the circumstances of the case after visit endanger the safety of the captor or involve the probable loss of the captured ship by recapture or unseaworthiness, the ship may be destroyed; but only on condition that the personnel, even of the enemy, be first removed from the ship to a place of safety and the ship's papers be saved for subsequent examination.

XII. No ship, not a vessel of war, is liable to attack and destruction, without previous visit and search, unless visit is evaded or resisted after summons; but the vessel is liable to the exercise of sufficient force to cause her to submit if she resists or attempts to escape.

On behalf of Subcommittee No. 2, Dr. Harry Pratt Judson, its chairman, presented a report on the subject of "The status of government vessels", which recommended the following formulation of rules:

1. Government vessels are those which are owned or requisitioned by or chartered to a government. If a vessel is controlled and directed by a government and employed for public purposes, it is immaterial whether the interest of the government is that of ownership, or is based upon charter or requisition.

2. A government vessel operated by the government for public purposes is immune from foreign judicial process.

3. A government vessel operated by private persons for commercial purposes is not immune from foreign judicial process.

4. A government vessel operated by the government for commercial purposes is immune from foreign judicial process, but injuries committed by such vessel should render the government liable in its own courts.

5. Municipal law determines the liabilities of government vessels in domestic courts.

6. Every government should accord, both by executive action and judicial decision, at least as favorable treatment to the vessels owned or controlled by a friendly foreign government as it accords to those owned or controlled by it.

7. Some convenient method of proof of the governmental character of foreign vessels should be adopted by international agreement.

Professor George Grafton Wilson, chairman of Subcommittee No. 3, presented a report on certain problems of maritime warfare, in which the subcommittee recommended the abolition of the distinction between absolute and conditional contraband of war and that "the doctrine of continuous voyage should not be extended beyond the principle: 'That the ultimate destination of a neutral vessel or cargo determines the liability of either to condemnation, but cargo otherwise innocent may become liable to condemnation if destined to aid the belligerent'".

Acting on behalf of Subcommittee No. 4, the chairman of which was unavoidably absent, Professor Jesse S. Reeves made an oral report on the subject of "Offenses which may be characterized as international crimes and procedure for their prevention", in which he outlined the difficulty as to the conception of an international crime, drawing a distinction between offenses recognized by international usage as "international" largely because of their universality, such as the slave trade, which are punished as crimes in accordance with municipal legislation, and international crimes in the strict sense involving the acts of persons in international law. He said that the subcommittee after full discussion came to the conclusion that not until the adoption of the Declaration of Washington relating to the acts of submarines had there been strictly speaking an international crime, having due regard to the word "international" and to the concept of crime. The provisions of this treaty, he said, introduced a new conception which points the way for an altogether different method of handling offenses which are international in the strict sense of the word. Other phases of the subject, such as other types of offenses which might be similarly designated with penalties, the international criminal liability of nationals of non-signatory Powers, and the nature of the court having jurisdiction over such offenses, the subcommittee, he reported, did not have time to consider.

Action upon the reports of the subcommittees was taken at the session on Saturday morning, April 29. After considerable discussion of the desirability of acting upon the recommendations, it was finally decided, in view of the limited time which the subcommittees had available for the preparation of the reports and which was available for discussion by the Society, to refer all of the reports with the recommendations to the Committee on Organization of Work for coördination, printing and distribution with a view to action at the next meeting on the Society.

In connection with the action upon these reports, there was a spirited debate as to whether the Society should confine its present work to consideration of the laws of war, as the result of which the following resolution was adopted:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that the Committee for the Advancement of International Law consider whether it is not within the purview of their plans to present to this Society at some forthcoming meeting the consideration of the feasibility of some international organization as a means of conducting the international relations of states.

After the adoption of the above resolution, it was further moved that all the members of the Society should be invited to present the topics which they consider fall within the purview of the work of the Committee for the Advancement of International Law and of the Society. Any members having such suggestions may send them to the Secretary, who will be glad to see that they are sent to the proper committee.

At the business session of the Society, which immediately followed, the amendment to the first two paragraphs of Article IV of the Constitution of the Society, printed in the last number of the Journal (April, 1922, p. 275), to provide an interval between the successive periods of service of members elected to the Executive Council, was adopted in the following form:

(Omit words in brackets and insert words in italics)

The officers of the Society shall consist of a President, an Honorary President, nine or more Vice-Presidents, the number to be fixed from time to time by the Executive Council, a Recording Secretary, a Corresponding Secretary, and a Treasurer, who shall be elected annually, and of an Executive Council composed of the [President, the Vice-Presidents] *foregoing officers*, ex officio, and twenty-four elected members, whose terms of office shall be three years, except that of those elected at the first election, eight shall serve for the period of one year only and eight for the period of two years, and that any one elected to fill a vacancy shall serve only for the unexpired term of the member in whose place he is chosen. *No elected member of the Executive Council shall be eligible for reelection until the next annual meeting after that at which his term of office expires.*

The Recording Secretary, the Corresponding Secretary and the Treasurer shall be elected by the Executive Council [from among its members]. The other officers of the Society shall be elected by the Society, except as hereinafter provided for the filling of vacancies occurring between elections.

The election of officers then ensued and the following were duly elected:

Honorary President

The Honorable WARREN G. HARDING
President of the United States.

President

Honorable ELIHU ROOT

Vice-Presidents

HON. CHANDLER P. ANDERSON	HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE
HON. SIMEON E. BALDWIN	HON. JOHN BASSETT MOORE
JUSTICE WILLIAM R. DAY	HON. WILLIAM W. MORROW
HON. JACOB M. DICKINSON	HON. OSCAR S. STRAUS
HON. GEORGE GRAY	HON. GEORGE SUTHERLAND
MR. CHARLES NOBLE GREGORY	HON. WILLIAM H. TAFT
HON. DAVID JAYNE HILL	MR. EVERETT P. WHEELER
HON. CHARLES E. HUGHES	PROF. GEORGE GRAFTON WILSON
HON. ROBERT LANSING	MR. THEODORE S. WOOLSEY

Members of the Executive Council to serve until 1925

EDWIN M. BORCHARD
 WILBUR J. CARR
 JOHN FOSTER DULLES
 CHARLES G. FENWICK

HARRY PRATT JUDSON
 ARTHUR K. KUHN
 JESSE S. REEVES
 ELLERY C. STOWELL

Pursuant to the amendment to the Constitution just adopted, the members of the Executive Council above named were all new men who had never served upon the Council. The Honorary President, the President and all of the Vice-Presidents were reelected, with the addition of the Honorable Chandler P. Anderson, the Honorable John Bassett Moore and Professor George Grafton Wilson to fill the vacancies caused by the deaths of the Honorable P. C. Knox, Honorable Horace Porter, and Chief Justice White.

Resolutions regarding the three deceased Vice-Presidents were unanimously adopted and spread upon the minutes, as was likewise a resolution relating to the late Lord Bryce.

At the meeting of the Executive Council which took place upon the adjournment of the Society, the following committees and officers were elected:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

HON. CHANDLER P. ANDERSON	HON. DAVID JAYNE HILL
HON. GEORGE GRAY	ADMIRAL CHAS. H. STOCKTON
MR. CHARLES NOBLE GREGORY	HON. ROBERT LANSING
PROF. GEORGE G. WILSON	

EX OFFICIO

HON. ELIHU ROOT, *President*
 HON. OSCAR S. STRAUS, *Chairman*
 MR. CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, *Treasurer*
 MR. JAMES BROWN SCOTT, *Recording Secretary*
 MR. CHARLES HENRY BUTLER, *Corresponding Secretary*

EDITORIAL BOARD OF THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

JAMES BROWN SCOTT, *Editor-in-Chief*

CHANDLER P. ANDERSON	CHARLES CHENEY HYDE
PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN	ROBERT LANSING
CHARLES NOBLE GREGORY	JOHN BASSETT MOORE
AMOS S. HERSHEY	JESSE S. REEVES
DAVID JAYNE HILL	GEORGE G. WILSON
THEODORE S. WOOLSEY	

GEORGE A. FINCH

Secretary Board of Editors and Business Manager

COMMITTEES

Standing Committee on Selection of Honorary Members: GEORGE G. WILSON, Chairman; JACKSON H. RALSTON, THEODORE S. WOOLSEY.

Standing Committee on Increase of Membership: OSCAR S. STRAUS, Chairman; PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN, CHARLES CHENEY HYDE, JOHN H. LATANÉ, JESSE S. REEVES, WILLIAM C. DENNIS.

Auditing Committee: JACKSON H. RALSTON, CHARLES RAY DEAN.

*Committee on Annual Meeting:*¹ JAMES BROWN SCOTT, Chairman; PHILIP M. BROWN, WILLIAM C. DENNIS, CHARLES G. FENWICK, GEORGE A. FINCH, ROBERT LANSING, JOHN H. LATANÉ, BRECKINRIDGE LONG, LESTER H. WOOLSEY.

COMMITTEE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

ELIHU ROOT, *Chairman*

JAMES BROWN SCOTT, *Secretary*

GEORGE A. FINCH, *Assistant Secretary*

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 1

To restate the established rules of international law, especially, and in the first instance, in the fields affected by the events of the recent war.

DAVID JAYNE HILL, *Chairman*

EDWIN D. DICKINSON

GEORGE A. KING

CHARLES B. ELLIOTT

HARRY SHEPARD KNAPP

CHARLES NOBLE GREGORY

ROBERT LANSING

AMOS S. HERSHEY

HAROLD S. QUIGLEY

GORDON E. SHERMAN

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 2

To formulate and agree upon the amendments and additions, if any, to the rules of international law shown to be necessary or useful by the events of the war and the changes in the conditions of international life and intercourse which have followed the war.

HARRY PRATT JUDSON, *Chairman*

EDWIN M. BORCHARD

JOHN H. LATANÉ

STERLING E. EDMUNDS

RALEIGH C. MINOR

WILLIAM I. HULL

CHARLES H. STOCKTON

HOWARD THAYER KINGSBURY

JAMES L. TRYON

ARTHUR K. KUHN

QUINCY WRIGHT

¹ Appointed by Chairman Scott by authority of the Executive Council.

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 3

To endeavor to reconcile divergent views and secure general agreement upon the rules which have been in dispute heretofore.

GEORGE GRAFTON WILSON, *Chairman*

CHANDLER P. ANDERSON	FREDERIC R. COUDERT
SIMEON E. BALDWIN	HENRY G. CROCKER
PERCY BORDWELL	JOHN FOSTER DULLES
CLEMENT L. BOUVÉ	LAWRENCE B. EVANS
PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN	CHARLES CHENEY HYDE
CHARLES HENRY BUTLER	BRECKINRIDGE LONG
WILLIAM MILLER COLLIER	FRANK C. PARTRIDGE
	LESTER H. WOOLSEY

SUBCOMMITTEE No. 4

To consider the subjects not now adequately regulated by international law, but as to which the interests of international justice require that rules of law shall be declared and accepted.

PAUL S. REINSCH, *Chairman*

CEPHAS D. ALLIN	W. R. MANNING
FRANCIS W. AYMAR	JAMES H. OLIVER
GEORGE C. BUTTE	J. H. RALSTON
W. C. DENNIS	JESSE S. REEVES
EDWARD C. ELIOT	ELLERY CORY STOWELL
CHARLES G. FENWICK	EUGENE WAMBAUGH
EDWARD A. HARRIMAN	THOMAS RAEBURN WHITE
	FRANK H. WOOD

The only notable change in the list of officers was the resignation of the Honorable Chandler P. Anderson, Treasurer of the Society since its organization. The following remarks and motion, the latter of which was un-animously adopted, shows the appreciation felt by the Society for Mr. Anderson's services:

Mr. CHARLES HENRY BUTLER. This meeting marks an epoch in the annals of the Society. For fifteen years the financial affairs of the Society have been in the hands of the same man, who accepted the responsibilities years ago as a favor to the Society, and has continued to perform the duties of Treasurer ever since. We all know that it has not been, by any means, a sinecure and that he has devoted a large part of his time and a great deal of his strength and mentality to the affairs of this Society, and no Society has ever had a more devoted and self-sacrificing official than this Society has had in Mr. Anderson.

I, therefore, move that we tender him our sincere thanks, and an expression of appreciation of what he has done, and our regret that it is necessary that we lose his valuable services.

The Sixteenth Annual Meeting closed with a banquet at the Washington Hotel on the evening of Saturday, April 29. Dr. Harry Pratt Judson, President of the University of Chicago, presided, and the guests of honor were Chief Justice William Howard Taft, of the Supreme Court of the United States, Secretary of Labor James J. Davis, and the Honorable Henry W. Temple, a member of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Chief Justice gave an interesting account of the action of the Supreme Court in suits between states; Mr. Davis touched upon international subjects, especially the immigration problem, from a point of view quite novel to international lawyers; and Mr. Temple made a scholarly address on the survival of tried methods in political development and urged the cooperation of enlightened men and women with the legislature in international matters.

The full texts of the addresses and papers, together with the verbatim report of the discussions, are being printed in the volume of annual proceedings, and will be ready for distribution within a few weeks. The volume may be obtained by members and subscribers for \$1.50.

GEORGE A. FINCH.

THE THIRTIETH CONFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL LAW ASSOCIATION

The thirtieth conference of the International Law Association, of London, (founded in 1873) was held at The Hague in the Palace of Peace August 30 to September 3, 1921. The printed report of the conference has now been issued. It consists of a compact volume of 541 pages giving the proceedings in general, together with a second volume of 312 pages devoted to the proceedings of the Maritime Law Committee. There was a registered attendance of 366 members at The Hague, including many eminent names from England and the United States. Among the latter are Hollis Bailey, Esq., representing the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, Honorable Charles B. Elliott, Dr. C. H. Huberich, Professor Edwin R. Keedy, Dr. Arthur K. Kuhn and Honorable Everett P. Wheeler. From England a very large delegation attended, including Sir Alan Garrett Anderson, Professor Hugh H. L. Bellot, Major Norman Bentwich, Sir Graham Bower, Viscount Cave, Right Hon. Sir Henry Duke, Professor A. Pearce Higgins, Sir Norman Hill, Sir William J. Noble, George G. Phillimore, Esq., Lord Phillimore, Captain J. Bell White, Roland Vaughan Williams, Esq., K. C. and Lord Justice Younger. Maître Edouard Clunet was there from France; His Excellency Louis Franck and Gaston de Leval from Belgium. The Conference was opened by His Royal Highness, Prince Henry. Professor Dr. D. Josephus Jitta, Councillor of State of The Netherlands, President of the Association, presided.

There were innumerable social courtesies and entertainments extended to the members by The Netherlands Government, the municipality of The Hague and many important organizations and individuals, and there were